

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claim 7 has been added. Claims 1-6 have been examined.

Claim 5 has been allowed and claims 2, 3 and 6 were identified as allowable if amended to recite the all of the limitations recited in the independent claims from which they depended. In response to the objection to claims 2, 3, and 6 and for the purpose of expediting issuance of a patent covering subject matter of this invention, Applicant has amended those claims to incorporate all of the limitations of the base claim.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 4

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Iwane (US Pat. No. 5,208,550 ("the '550 patent")) and claim 1 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Iwane (US Pat. No. 5,212,814 ("the '814 patent")). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1 and 4 and requests favorable disposition of the application.

In particular, Applicant submits that neither the '550 patent nor the '814 patent teach, or suggest, all of the recited elements of either claim 1 or claim 4. For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an RF power sensor to sense the power level of the RF input. Neither the '550 nor the '814 disclose such a sensor.

With respect to the '550 patent, the grounds of rejection rely on column 5, lines 18-57 as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 1. However, no structure disclosed within the cited passage, i.e., claim 1, of the '550 patent senses the power level of an RF input signal, as required. In comparison, the '550 patent discloses "an extracting

means for extracting part of the output power” of the amplifier and “a high-frequency detecting means for detecting the magnitude of the output signal of the extracting means.” (Col. 5, lines 26-36). Similar to the ‘550 patent the ‘814 patent also fails to disclose the claimed RF sensor of claim 1. More particularly, the ‘814 patent discloses an amplifier in which “the output signals of a high frequency power amplifier” are detected. (Col. 2, lines 13-14). An RF input signal is neither sensed nor detected in either the ‘550 or the ‘814 patent. For at least this reason claim 1 is not anticipated by either the ‘550 patent or the ‘814 patent.

Further, neither the ‘550 patent nor the ‘814 patent disclose a plurality of transmit/Receive switches for time division duplex operation connected to said transmit chain and receive circuit, as also required by claim 1 of the instant application. In particular, the ‘550 and ‘814 patents do not anywhere disclose bi-directional or time division duplex (TDD) operation. Because neither the ‘550 patent nor the ‘814 patent contemplates TDD operation, it is not surprising that neither patent discloses switches that are connected to a transmit chain and a receive circuit.

The grounds of rejection state that the ‘550 patent discloses the recited switches within its claim 1. However, the only “switching” disclosed in the ‘550 patent relates to switching the output power level, i.e., using a “power level switch control signal” generated by controller. For example, as shown in FIG. 1, a portion of the RF output signal 4 is variably attenuated by variable attenuator 11 before the output power is detected by detector circuit 6. The only “switching” that takes place is in the context of the “power level switch control signal 10a” which is used to control the level of

attenuation provided by attenuator 11. The '814 patent also fails to disclose a switch connected to a transmit path and a receive circuit and, in particular, a switch used for time-division duplex operation. For this additional reason neither the '550 patent nor the '814 patent anticipates claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, means for switching between transmitting and receiving power said switch means being operatively connected in a loop with said means for controlling output gain and a filter. The grounds of rejection assert that the '550 patent teaches each and every element of claim 4, including the means for switching. Applicant respectfully disagrees for similar reasons as those set forth above with respect to claim 1. In particular, the '550 patent does not disclose any structure or device for switching between transmitting and receiving. Accordingly, claim 4 is not anticipated by, or even suggested by, the '550 patent.

Patentability of New Claim 7

New independent claim 7 has been added. Claim 7 is patentable over the art of record at least because the prior art fails to teach or suggest any of, an RF level detector for detecting a power level of the transmit RF input signal, an RF output port operable to transmit the transmit RF output signal and further operable to receive a receive RF input signal, a receive circuit operable to receive the receive RF input signal from said RF output port and a switch operable to connect said amplifier circuit to said RF output port when the RF amplifier is in a transmit mode and connect said RF output port to said receive circuit when the RF amplifier is in a receive mode.

Atty. Docket No. 334.0003DIV
Amendment Dated March 23, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 17, 2006
Appl. No. 10/743,754

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the application is now in form for allowance of all claims. Such favorable action is respectfully solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
CAHN & SAMUELS, LLP

By: 

Kevin M. Barner, Esq.
Reg. No. 46,075
2000 P Street, N.W. (Suite 200)
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 331-8777
Facsimile: (202) 331-3838

July 12, 2006